Minutes
Enterprise Architecture Committee

DATE	September 16, 2004
TIME	9:30 AM
LOCATION	Department of Information Technology Large Conference Room – 4th Floor Carson City, NV 89701
RECORDER	Maggie Thorne

ATTENDANCE

	Present		Present
Chair – Dave McTeer, Dept of Administration	✔	Co-Chair, Terry Savage, Dept of Information Technology	✔
Joe Bertolone, Gaming Control		Alan Rogers, Public Safety	
Gary Buonacorsi, Welfare		Robert Roth, UCCSN	
Chuck Conner, DMV	✔	Kathy Ryan, DoIT	
Alisanne Maffei, DoIT	✔	Kathi Shabi, DETR	
Dorothy Martin, NDOT		Roger Sliva, DoIT	✔
Chuck Moltz, Attorney General	✔	Rich Stewart, Corrections	
Grant Reynolds, B&I	✔	Tom Wolf, NOMADS	
Ernie Hernandez, Health	✔		

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dave McTeer called the meeting to order. Dave commented that absent members should be called who have not attended any meetings since the inception. Terry Savage added that with the NV Communications Steering Committee they have a rule that if you miss two meetings in a row you are automatically dropped. Roger Sliva mentioned that the only agency that has yet to be represented was Gaming Control.

II ROLL CALL/MINUTES

A motion was made by Terry Savage and seconded by Ernie Hernandez to approved the minutes from the August 19th meeting as presented. Motion carried.

III. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE CHARTER

A motion was made by Terry Savage and seconded by Chuck Conner to approve the charter as presented. Motion carried.

Chuck did question the statement of ...for the great good of the state, but it was agreed that the Charter could be amended at a later date, but for now everyone was okay with leaving it as presented. Chuck did add that the definition of Enterprise Architecture needs to be addressed and Roger indicated that it was agreed at the last meeting two incorporate the definition into the policy when created. After some discussion, Dave McTeer asked that the minutes reflect that the EA Committee will have a policy written which will include the definition of EA and that the NITOC policy will handle the exception process.

IV.   PRESENTATION OF AN EXAMPLE OF EA INTIATIVE OUTPUTS

Roger Sliva presented a 6-page (sample) example of what an EA Output would look like. The example was based on an Enterprise E-Payment Service. It reflected what documents might be generated for a target architecture. The sample was based on reality but is not a real architecture and contained hypothetical examples. The sample was just a "slice" of the prospective architecture and did not include the security infrastructure or other necessary pieces.

V.   COMMITTEE ROLE IN EA INITIATIVES

Roger distributed a 2-page document to the members of the EA Initiative Process and Outputs and briefly went through the document.

Terry spoke about the differences between Open Standards and Open Source (OS) and felt that Open Source was not a good idea. Roger commented with the argument that OS is happening, it's happening very quickly, it's proliferating and we have no control over it. Dave McTeer told Terry that at the last minute this was discussed heavily and it's a moving target, people are going to get it anyway, but this way the Committee could get a step ahead and see some successes. The Committee felt it was doable.

Discussion was then held on identifying issues, goals, opportunities and scopes the initiative of Open Source

Roger had the members indicate their philosophy on "Open Source Software" (OSS)

1. No OSS   (one vote)
2. May use OSS with restrictions   (two votes)
3. Choose propriety or OSS   (three votes)
4. Should (required to) use OSS   (no votes)

Terry asked Roger to send the above to the Committee members that were not present to get their opinion as well. Roger agreed he would.

Dave McTeer commented that the initiative has to be split apart – that servers and desktops need to be separated. Ernie commented that Clark County, representing 65% of the population, drives a lot of the decisions for the State. He said if you don't follow (Clark County) their lead, they wouldn't play with you.

VI.   ISSUES

Roger Sliva drafted the following Pros/Cons (good-bad) for the members on the white board:

Good: Save money initially, prevent vendor lock in, create interoperability through increased opportunities, big hitting support by IBM/Novel and others, generally more secure, licensing

Bad: Long term costs, proliferation, possible use of inferior products, vendor lock-out, lack of windows compatibility

Neutral: Total Cost of Ownership

Goals of Architecture
Roger summarized the goals of architecture:

Reduce Costs
Reduce proliferation/purchasing
Set appropriate limits
- criteria/guidelines for decision
- decision guidelines
Help IT poor agencies
Be prepared for the Legislature

Roger commented that we will be able to model the business activities that are happening in the State. In order to know what and how to do product selection and what the appropriate limits are, we need to know what are the business activities (example, e-mail, screen capture, providing DNS service, web services). He will also be looking at the open system/open architecture standards.

Roger finished the meeting on Scope:
Business prospective
Service prospective and
Technical prospective

Roger asked the group, in order to narrow the field, their preference to focus on server or desktop. Dave McTeer said to start with the server side because that is an easier task and well defined, and then move to the desktop, which may be stickier.

Roger said he had enough to begin and would be providing some current state architecture for the committee to review and discuss at their next meeting.

VII.   ADJOURNMENT
The meeting ended at 11:30. The next meeting will be held October 21st at 9:30 – 11:30.